IN THE HIGH COURT OF KERALA AT ERNAKULAM

PRESENT :

THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE S.SIRI JAGAN

FRIDAY, THE 13TH APRIL 2007 / 23RD CHAITHRA 1929

WP(C).No. 13341 of 2007(L)

PETITIONER:

SAJITH KUMAR,
KRISHNA MANDIRAM,
VADAKARA.P.O.,
THALAYOLAPARAMBU,
KOTTAYAM.

BY ADV. SRI.J.JULIAN XAVIER

RESPONDENTS:

---

1. REVENUE DIVISIONAL OFFICER,
   PALA.

2. VILLAGE OFFICER, VELLOOR,
   KOTTAYAM.

3. CIRCLE INSPECTOR OF POLICE,
   KADUTHURUTHY.

4. NARAYANAN,
   THULASI VEEDU,
   VADAKARA.P.O.,
   THALAYOLAPARAMBU,
   KOTTAYAM.

5. MINI NARAYANAN,
   THULASI VEEDU,
   VADAKARA.P.O.,
   THALAYOLAPARAMBU,
   KOTTAYAM.

R1 TO R3 BY GOVT. PLEADER SRI.I.V.PRAMOD.

THIS WRIT PETITION (CIVIL) HAVING COME UP FOR ADMISSION ON 13/04/2007, THE COURT ON THE SAME DAY DELIVERED THE FOLLOWING:

S. SIRI JAGAN, J.

WP(C) NO. 13341 OF 2007 - L

Dated this the 13th day of April, 2007

J U D G M E N T

At the instance of respondents 4 and 5, the petitioner alleges that the Revenue Divisional Officer has initiated proceedings against the S.S.I.Unit of the petitioner manufacturing wire cut bricks. According to the petitioner, there is no reason why the Revenue Divisional Officer should take any action since the petitioner is running the unit with all necessary licences, permits and consent. The petitioner alleges that although the case was heard on 28.3.2007 and the first respondent- R.D.O. had promised to drop all the proceedings. However, when he later contacted the office of the first respondent, he was informed that since the first respondent was about to retire on 30.4.2007, he has not passed any order on 28.3.2007 and adjourned the case to 2.5.2007. The petitioner submits that his work is of a seasonal nature which has to be completed before the onset of the next monsoon and if there is any further delay in cancelling the stop memo issued by the Village Officer as per the directions of the R.D.O., the petitioner

would suffer huge damages because this is his only source of income. The petitioner therefore challenges the proceedings initiated. However, for the present, he would be satisfied with a direction to the first respondent to pass final orders in the proceedings pending before him within the shortest possible time.

2. I have heard learned counsel for the petitioners as also the learned Government Pleader appearing for respondents 1 to 3.

3. In the nature of the order I propose to pass, I do not think it is necessary to issue notice to respondents 4 and 5. In the facts and circumstances of the case, there would be a direction to the first respondent to pass final orders in respect of the stop memo issued to the petitioner latest, within two weeks from the date of receipt of a copy of this judgment.

The writ petition is disposed of with the above direction.

S. SIRI JAGAN,
Judge

Mbs/

S.SIRI JAGAN, J

W.P.(C) NO. OF 2001

J U D G M E N T

DATED:13-02-2007